



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,234	02/22/2002	David Konopnicki	02/23229	1417
7590 Martin D. Moynihan PRTSI, Inc. P. O. Box 16446 Arlington, VA 22215				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, NGA B				
ART UNIT 3692				
PAPER NUMBER				
MAIL DATE 04/01/2009				
DELIVERY MODE PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/069,234

Applicant(s)

KONOPNICKI ET AL.

Examiner

Nga B. Nguyen

Art Unit

3692

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on January 2, 2009, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been fully considered but are moot not persuasive.

In response to the applicant argument that Kennedy does not relate to the user's intention, objectives and desires or generate request itself, examiner submits that Kennedy discloses *column 4, lines 25-35, buyer issues new request, seller offers new promise, the request and promise are user's intentions because they are objectives and desires of the buyer and seller.*

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies "the data processor in Kennedy does not generate intentions, the requests or promises are generated by the users" are not recited in the rejected claims because the claims are not required that the intentions are totally generated by the data processor. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Moreover, the amended claims submitted do not overcome the 35 USC § 101 (see details below).

In conclusion, examiner decides to maintain the previous rejection (also see details below) and make this Office action FINAL.

4. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-29, 38, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to a machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to a machine and can be performed without the use of a particular machine. Thus, claims 1-29, 38, 39 and 42 are non-statutory since they may be performed within the human mind.

The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101.

Note the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion Ex parte Langemyer et al.

Claims 30-37, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims recite "a system" but the claiming structure limitations of the claims are computer code per-se, are non-statutory..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kennedy et al. (hereinafter Kennedy), U.S. Patent No. 6,055,519.

Regarding to claim 1, Kennedy discloses a method for at least semi-automatically directly negotiating a relationship between at least a first user party and a second user party, the parties being at respective first and second computers connected over a network, the steps of the method being performed by a data processor, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a first intention for the first user party and a second intention for the second user party, each of said first intention and said second intention featuring a plurality of components (*column 4, lines 25-35, buyer issues new request, seller offers new promise*);

(b) over said network, exchanging at least one dispatch between the first user party and the second user party, said at least one dispatch including a reference to a value for at least one of said plurality of components (*figure 2 and column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50, buyer and seller negotiate; column 4, lines 20-25, items, quantities, dates, etc.*);

(c) generating a merged portion according to said reference to said value in said at least one dispatch, said generating comprising merging at least a portion of said first user intervention and at least a portion of said second user intention (*column 7, lines 1-15, lines 60-65*);

(d) altering at least one of said first intention for the first user party and said second intention for the second user party with said merged portion (*column 6, lines 25-40, buyer re-issues an altered request, seller generates a new promise*);

(e) comparing said first user intention to said second user intention (*column 9, lines 35-45, detecting the differences of the deals between buyer and seller*); and

(f) if said first user intention matches said second user intention, determining the relationship according to said merged user intention (*column 7, lines 60-65*).

Regarding to claim 2, Kennedy further discloses wherein said reference to said value is selected from the group consisting of a variable component, an actual value, a request for a value from said second party, and a request to select a value from a set of values for said second party (*column 4, lines 20-25, items, quantities, dates, etc.*).

Regarding to claim 3, Kennedy further discloses wherein said reference to said value is determined by a compiled goal program and negotiation parameters of said first

or said second intentions (column 9, lines 45-55).

Regarding to claim 4, Kennedy further discloses wherein said compiled goal program is used to create at least one procedure selected from the group consisting of: (i) suggest a tuple of values; (ii) choose from a number of alternative tuples of values; (iii) rank tuples of values according to a desirability; and (iv) suggest an improvement to an input tuple of values (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 5, Kennedy further discloses wherein said step of negotiating said relationship between said at least said first party and said second party is effected by, at least in part, using a structure selected from the group consisting of one-to-one with or without revealing and one-to-many without revealing (column 3, lines 50-60).

Regarding to claim 6, Kennedy further discloses wherein at least two goal programs are combined to form a combined goal program, which encodes said constraints, said preferences and said negotiation parameters of at least said first or said second intentions (column 9, lines 45-55).

Regarding to claims 7-8, Kennedy further discloses wherein said variable component is associated with a predefined default interval, wherein said default interval is associated with at least one value, at least one range of values or a combination of at least one value and at least one range of values (column 11, lines 1-15).

Regarding to claim 9, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (c) is performed by merging at least a portion of said first intention and at least a portion of said second intention to form a merged intention, such that the relationship is defined according to said merged intention (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 10, Kennedy further discloses wherein only a portion of said first intention and only a portion of said second intention are merged to form the relationship (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 11, Kennedy further discloses wherein an entirety of said first intention and an entirety of said second intention are merged to form the relationship (column 7, lines 1-15).

Regarding to claim 12, Kennedy further discloses wherein said first intention and said second intention are incomplete, such that step (b) further comprises the steps of: (i) defining at least one computational device for adding at least one suggested component to at least one intention; (ii) executing said at least one computational device to obtain said suggested component; and (iii) sending a message from the first party to the second party, said message including a suggested component according to said at least one computational device (column 7, lines 15-30)

Regarding to claim 13, Kennedy further discloses wherein said dispatch of step (b) also includes said first intention of said first party and is sent from said first party to said second party, such that said second party adds said suggested component to said merged intention (column 4, lines 55-67).

Regarding to claim 14, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (b) further comprises the step of: (iv) determining by said second party whether to accept said suggested component (column 4, lines 64-67).

Regarding to claim 15, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (b) further comprises the step of: (iv) providing a value for said suggested component by said

second party (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 16, Kennedy further discloses wherein said first intention and said second intention are incomplete, such that step (b) further comprises the steps of: (i) defining at least one computational device at the second party for adding at least one suggested component to at least one intention; (ii) executing said at least one computational device to obtain said suggested component; and (iii) sending a message from the second party to the first party, said message including a suggested component according to said at least one computational device (column 7, lines 15-30).

Regarding to claim 17, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (b) further comprises the step of: (i) providing a value for at least one component by said second party (column 7, lines 60-65)

Regarding to claim 18, Kennedy further discloses wherein said component also includes a constraint for restricting said value (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 19, Kennedy further discloses wherein said constraint determines that said value is not alterable (column 7, lines 60-67, quantities is not altered in this deal).

Regarding to claim 20, Kennedy further discloses wherein said constraint determines that said value is alterable, such that step (b) further comprises the step of sending a return message with a counter offer for altering said value of said at least one variable by at least one of the fast party and the second party (column 7, lines 60-65, date is altered in this deal).

Regarding to claim 21, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (c) further

comprises the step of removing at least one constraint from at least one component (column 7, lines 1-15).

Regarding to claim 22, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (c) further comprises the step of saving a state of each of said first intention and said second intention to form a previous state, before altering said first intention and said second intention, the method further comprising the step of: (f) if said first intention does not match said second intention, returning said first intention and said second intention to said previous state (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50).

Regarding to claim 23, Kennedy further discloses the method further comprising the step of: if said first intention matches said second intention, notifying each party of acceptance of the relationship (column 9, lines 15-25).

Regarding to claim 24, Kennedy further discloses wherein said first intention and said second intention are each constructed as a first intention tree and a second intention tree, respectively, such that step (d) is performed by comparing said first tree to said second tree (columns 9-10).

Regarding to claim 25, Kennedy further discloses wherein step (c) is performed by merging at least a portion of said first tree and at least a portion of said second tree to form a merged tree, such that the relationship is defined according to said merged tree (columns 11-12).

Regarding to claim 26, Kennedy further discloses wherein only a portion of said first tree and only a portion of said second tree are merged to form the relationship (columns 11-12).

Regarding to claim 27, Kennedy further discloses wherein an entirety of said first tree and an entirety of said second tree are merged to form the relationship (columns 11-12).

Regarding to claim 28, Kennedy further discloses wherein each component is constructed from a set of shared classes for the first party and the second party (columns 11-12).

Regarding to claim 29, Kennedy further discloses wherein the relationship is determined as a contract, said contract featuring a plurality of intentions, such that steps (a)-(e) are performed for each of said plurality of intentions (column 8, lines 50-65).

Regarding to claim 30, Kennedy discloses a system of a plurality of computers connected over a network, for at least semi-automatically directly negotiating a relationship between a plurality of user parties in respect of components taking a value, the system comprising:

(a) a plurality of user party modules at respective ones of said plurality of computers, including at least a first user party module and a second user party module, each user party module featuring a user intention for determining the relationship, said user intentions respectively featuring a plurality of components in common to be determined for the relationship and respective values, such that a process of negotiation matches said intention of said first user party module to said intention of said second user party module (column 3, line 60-column 4, line 18, seller has negotiation engine, buyer has negotiation client); and

(b) a central server connected to said p plurality of computers over said network

configured at least initially connecting at least said first user party module to at least said second user party module for performing directly negotiations to reach said agreed value, said negotiating comprising generating a common user intention by merging of said respective user party intention (figure 1 and column 3, lines 60-67, seller system is equivalent to a central server).

Regarding to claim 31, Kennedy further discloses wherein at least said first party module features a plurality of intentions for negotiating with a plurality of parties (column 8, lines 35-41).

Regarding to claim 32, Kennedy further discloses wherein said central server further comprises a server party module for performing said negotiations on behalf of at least one party (figure 1 and column 3, lines 60-67, seller system includes negotiation engine).

Regarding to claim 33, Kennedy further discloses wherein only said server party module performs said negotiations on behalf of a plurality of parties (column 4, lines 5-17, buyer has negation client).

Regarding to claim 34, Kennedy further discloses wherein said central server further comprises a server party module for performing said negotiations on behalf of said central server as a broker (figure 1 and column 3, lines 60-67, seller system includes negotiation engine).

Regarding to claim 35, Kennedy further discloses wherein said party modules perform said negotiations and said central server only initially connects said first party module to said second party module (figure 1 and column 3, lines 60-67, seller system

includes negotiation engine).

Regarding to claim 36, Kennedy further discloses wherein at least one party module features at least one computational device for generating a suggested alteration to said intention according to at least one rule, such that if said first intention does not match said second intention, said suggested alteration is generated by said at least one computational device (column 3, line 60-column 4, line 17).

Regarding to claim 37, Kennedy further discloses wherein at least one party module further features at least one computational device for determining if said suggested alteration is accepted (column 3, line 60-column 4, line 17).

Regarding to claim 38, Kennedy discloses a method for at least semi-automatically directly negotiating a relationship between at least a first user party and a second user party, said user parties being at respective computational devices connected over a network, the relationship relating to components, the method being performed by a data processor, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) generating a first intention for the first user party and a second intention for the second user party, each of said first intention and said second intention featuring a plurality of components (column 4, lines 25-35, buyer issues new request, seller offers new promise);

(b) comparing said first intention to said second intention (column 9, lines 35-45, detecting the differences of the deals between buyer and seller);

(c) if said first intention is different than said second intention, providing for one of said computational devices to define an additional component for the intention of at

least the first user party (column 6, lines 25-40, buyer re-issues an altered request, seller generates a new promise; column 7, lines 15-30).

(e) sending at least one message from the first party to the second party, said at least one message including said additional component (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50);

(f) determining if said additional component is accepted by the second party (column 4, lines 60-67);

(g) if said additional component is accepted by the second party, adding said additional component to said first intention for the first party and to said second intention for the second party (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50);

(h) repeating step (c) at least once (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50); and

(i) if said first intention matches said second intention, then merging the respective first and second intentions to form a common user intention, and determining the relationship according to said common intention (column 7, lines 60-65).

Regarding to claim 39, Kennedy further discloses wherein steps (d) to (i) are repeated at least once (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50).

Regarding to claim 40, Kennedy discloses use in a system for at least semi-automatically directly negotiating a relationship between a first user party and a second user party, each of the first user party and the user second party having a first user intention and a user second intention, respectively, such that the relationship is negotiated by matching the first user intention and the second user intention, a device operated by at least one of the first party and the second party, the device comprising a

memory, a processor, a first party user-interface and a second party user interface:

(a) an intention data structure within said memory, configured for holding an intention (column 3, line 60-column 4, line 17);

(b) a negotiation control program operable on said processor configured for controlling a process of negotiation between said user via said respective user interfaces (column 3, line 60-column 4, line 17); and

(c) a unifier, associated with said negotiation control program on said processor configured to unify said user intentions via said intention data structure of said memory via said process of negotiation between users, said negotiation being via said user interfaces to form a merged user intention within said data structure, said merged user intention unifying said respective first and second intentions, therefrom to define (columns 9-10).

Regarding to claim 41, Kennedy further discloses wherein said intention data structure includes at least one constraint, the device further comprising:(d) a constraint solver for solving said at least one constraint (columns 11-12).

Regarding to claim 42, Kennedy discloses method of creating a minimizing goal for a level within a goal program for at least semi-automatically directly negotiating a relationship between at least a first user party and a second user party, the parties being at respective first and second electronic computers connected over a network,, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing in a manner accessible to said parties at said electronic computers

over said network a goal program having a plurality of levels, at least some of said levels including constraints (column 4, line 35-column 5, line 50)

(b) identifying constraints within a respective level (columns 11-12);

(c) normalizing each of said constraints so as to obtain normalized constraints (columns 11-12); and

(d) combining said normalized constraints to created said minimized goal for said level (columns 11-12).

Conclusion

9. Claims **1-42** are rejected.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-6783.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communication intended for entry),

or

(571) 273-6796 (for informal or draft communication, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nga B. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692

March 23, 2009